



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

52

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/754,007 | 01/02/2001 | A. Storm | 52637-0015 | 3442 |

29989 7590 08/05/2004

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

TRAN, KHA I

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2637

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/754,007

Applicant(s)

STORM ET AL.

Examiner

KHAI TRAN

Art Unit

2637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 10-17, 22, 23, 26-29 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9, 18-21 and 30-33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 4-6, 9, 15, 28, 32 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3, 8, 9, 11, 12</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2637

DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment A filed 7/27/01 has been entered. Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2-41 are pending in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 39-40 are narrative in form and do not contain positively recited **steps** of a specific process. Note that method claims should be set forth **a series of steps** in the active tense in an instruction-like manner thereby reciting an actual method. The claim only recites a **single step** without any additional **steps delimiting** how its use is actually practiced. Dependent claims (if applicable) should further limit base claims by reciting additional method steps in a likewise fashion. Ex parte Erlich 3UPQ2d 1011 at 1017 [6]

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2637

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, 26, 27-29, 37, 38, 39-41 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8, 14, 24-28, 30, 35, 36, 45, 49-50, 59, 67-69 of copending Application No. 10/056,728. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, 26, 27-29, 37, 38, 39-41 of the instant application merely broadens the scope of the claims 1, 8, 14, 24-28, 30, 35, 36, 45, 49-50, 59, 67-69 of the co-pending Application No. 10/056,728 by eliminating the elements and their functions of claims 1, 8, 14, 24-28, 30, 35, 36, 45, 49-50, 59, 67-69 of the copending application. It has been held that the omission an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Regarding claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, 26, 27-29, 37, 38, 39-41 of the instant application disclose a step of receiving data based on upon both modulated data and distortion introduced by the communication channel instead of noise as recited in claims 1, 8, 14, 24-28, 30, 35, 36, 45, 49-50, 59, 67-69 of the U.S. application '728. However; it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the noise in the communication channel because the

Art Unit: 2637

noise can create the distortion. The both inventions are to reduce noise the distortion or the noise power.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

phone interview of applicant on 11/29/04 AS
6. Claims 2, 3, 10-11, 12, 13, 14, 22-23, 24, 25, 26, 34-35, 36, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (U.S. Pat. 6,388,513).

Wright et al disclose a method for processing data received from a communications channel as shown in Figures 15 and 16, comprising: receiving, from the communications channel, received data based upon both modulated data and distortion introduced by the communication channel (a bulk delay, gain and phase stage 74 followed an FIR filter 76 which incorporates the frequency domain variations of these

Art Unit: 2637

parameters); equalizing the receiving data using an equalizer to generate equalized data, wherein the equalizer uses an algorithm with a set of one or more coefficients selected to account for a frequency domain response of the equalizer (col. 27, lines 40-55). Wright et al fail to disclose a step of recovering an estimate of the original data by demodulating the equalized data. However, Wright et al disclose the coefficients of the FIR filter are stored in a data structure 78 that is indexed by input power or signal amplitude (col. 27, lines 40-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the coefficients of the equalizer stored in the storage to recover the original data.

Regarding claim 3, Wright et al disclose wherein the set of one or more coefficients being selected to reduce variations in the frequency domain response of the equalizer (col. 27, lines 40-55).

Regarding claims 10-11, Wright et al disclose a FIR filter 76.

Regarding claim 12, Wright et al disclose an A/D converter 68 (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 13, Wright et al disclose wherein communication channel is a twisted pair telephone line (col. 59, lines 48-67).

Claims 14, 22-23, 24, 25, 26, 34-35, 36, 38 are similar to claims 2, 3, 10-11, 12, 13. Therefore, claims 14, 22-23, 24, 25, 26, 34-35, 36, 38 are rejected under a similar rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4, 6-9, 15, 18-21, ^{16,} ^{28,} 30-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wright et al (US 2002/0044014 A1) disclose an amplifier measurement.

Storm et al (US 2002/0131537 A1) disclose an approaching for processing data received from a communications channel to reduce noise power.

Blanchard et al (U.S. Pat. 5,703,903) disclose an adaptive filter.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHAI TRAN whose telephone number is (703) 305-1876. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAY PATEL can be reached on (703) 308-7728. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


KHAI TRAN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2637

KT
August 3, 2004